

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,292	06/26/2001	Brad A. Armstrong	28 4333 EXAMINER	
7	7590 02/22/2005			
Brad A. Armstrong			CHOW, DOON Y	
P.O. Box 2048 Carson City, NV 89702			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2675	
			DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/893,292	ARMSTRONG, BRAD A.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Dennis-Doon Chow	2675			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timey within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 C	ctober 2004.	•			
·— · ·	·				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)	<u>206-220</u> is/are withdrawn from cor e rejected.	nsideration.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Applicati Irity documents have been receive In (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
	·	,			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group XIII, Claims 193-194, 204-205 and 221-230 in the reply filed on 10/5/2004 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 193-194 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wislocki (US 4933670) in view of Satoshi (JP 9213168), Inoue (5207426) and Poulsom (DE 40013227).

Wislocki disclose a mutiple axes controller comprising at least fourteen keys (86 and 88, Fig. 2) and a two-axes member positioned on the controller to activate two optical sensors (40 and 50, Fig. 1). The controller inherently comprises at least twelve sensors since each of the two optical sensors inherently comprises two sensors for sensing movements of opposition directions with a same axis, and each of the at least fourteen keys inherently comprises at least one sensor.

Wislocki does not explicitly disclose the key sensors are proportional sensors.

However, using proportional sensors as key sensors is well known in the art. Satoshi,

for example, teaches proportional pressure sensors. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use Satoshi's proportional pressure sensors as the key sensors in Wislocki's controller since Wislocki does not disclose use any specific sensors as the key sensors.

Wislocki does not disclose including two sensors in a single key.

Inoue discloses a single (12) having multiple sensors.

In light of Inoue, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine two of Wislocki's keys into a single key to activate to sensors. This would have been obvious because it reduces the structures of the keys.

Wislocki does not disclose a vibration feedback member.

Poulsom disclose a controller comprising a feedback motor generates a vibration feedback.

In light of Poulsom, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use Poulsom's feedback means in Wislocki's controller so that a vibration feedback can be generated.

4. Claims 204-205 and 221 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wislocki (US 4933670) in view of Satoshi (JP 9213168) and Poulsom (DE 40013227).

Regarding to claims 204-205, the disclosures of Wislocki, Satoshi and Poulsom in the above paragraphs apply here as well.

Application/Control Number: 09/893,292

Art Unit: 2675

Regarding to claim 221, the disclosures of Wislocki, Satoshi and Poulsom in the above paragraphs apply here as well.

Wislocki further discloses a rotating member (Fig. 1) for generating 3D signals. The rotating member inherently comprises six sensors, two for each axis of three axes. Wislocki does not disclose the rotating member comprises twelve sensors. However, it is considered a matter of obvious design choice to add additional six sensors to the rotating member since this does not provide any unexpected result.

5. Claims 222, 224-226, 228 and 230 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King (4555960) in view of Poulsom (DE 4013227).

King disclose an image controller comprising a three-axes member for activating a plurality of sensors to generating signal information, and a rotating member for a plurality of sensors to generating signal information. King does not explicitly disclose each of rotating member and the three-axes member activating twelve sensors.

However, it is considered a matter of obvious design choice to use each of the rotating member and the three-axes member for activating twelve sensors since this does not provide any unexpected result.

King does not disclose a vibration feedback member.

Poulsom discloses a controller comprising a vibration feedback member for generating a vibration feedback. The vibration feedback member includes a motor a weight member.

In light of Poulsom, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use Poulsom's feedback member in King's controller so that a vibration feedback can be generated.

6. Claims 223, 227 and 229 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King in view of Poulsom as applied to claims 222, 224-226, 228 and 230 above, and further in view of Asher (5689285).

King does not disclose the sensors are pressure-sensitive sensors.

Asher discloses a controller comprising a plurality of small size pressuresensitive sensors for generating control signals.

In light of Asher, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to substitute Asher pressure-sensitive sensors for King's sensors because the sizes of Asher's pressure-sensitive sensors are a lot smaller than King's sensors. By replacing King's sensors with Asher's pressure-sensitive sensors, the sizes of the sensors can be significantly reduced.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis-Doon Chow whose telephone number is 703-305-4398. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, Alternate Monday off.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/893,292 Page 6

Art Unit: 2675

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Chow February 19, 2005

> DENNIS-DOON CHOW PRIMARY EXAMINER